



## Federal Conference Report

Brighton  
22 – 26 September 2012

*This report contains the policy motions, business motions, and constitutional amendments passed by Conference, as amended. Defeated motions have not been included. It also includes questions on reports of party bodies.*

### Policy Motions

#### ***Addressing Underprovision in Mental Health***

Conference notes the report by The Centre for Economic Performance's Mental Health Policy Group *How Mental Illness Loses out in the NHS* (June 2012) and in particular the overall conclusion of the report that the under-treatment of people with crippling mental illnesses is the most glaring case of health inequality in our country.

Conference also notes the high prevalence of co-occurring conditions and problems associated with mental ill-health, particularly affecting those from deprived backgrounds, which include, but are not limited to: substance misuse, homelessness, unemployment, low educational attainment, family breakdown and offending behaviour.

Conference further notes the *Count Me In* Census Results 2010 showing that 23% of mental health inpatients were from BME communities.

Conference believes the following findings in the report need to be addressed:

- a) Among people under 65, nearly half of all ill health is mental illness and this is generally more debilitating than most chronic physical conditions; yet only a quarter of all those with mental illness are in treatment compared with those with physical conditions.
- b) There are 6 million people with depression or crippling anxiety conditions and 700,000 children with problem behaviours, anxiety or depression in the UK, yet three quarters of each group get no treatment.
- c) Untreated mental illness costs the NHS over £10 billion in physical healthcare costs per year.
- d) Mental illness reduces GDP by £52 billion per year (4.1%).
- e) Mental illness is most common in the poorest 20% of the population.

Conference is also concerned that people with mental health conditions associated with other complex needs are the least likely people to access appropriate support, and are most likely to end up in prison or in Accident and Emergency services, at a high cost to the taxpayer.

Conference welcomes the important conclusion in the report that mental health provision can be improved at zero net cost to the taxpayer as the resultant savings would outweigh the initial cost.

Conference commends the work of Liberal Democrat Minister Paul Burstow MP in raising the profile of mental health and welcomes the publication of the national strategy *No Health Without Mental Health*.

Conference welcomes the extra £22 million investment in the children and young people's Improved Access to Psychological Therapy (IAPT) programme and the £400 million investment in the adult IAPT scheme.

Conference believes the Coalition Government can go further in giving priority to mental health provision and therefore calls for:

1. Central government to ensure mental health policies are being implemented on the ground, for example ensuring local NHS commissioners spend the £400 million they have been given for IAPT, whilst continuing to fund other vital services such as assertive outreach which can be accessed outside of GP pathways.
2. The inclusion of IAPT targets in the NHS Outcomes Framework.
3. The continuation of the IAPT programme beyond 2014 (the end date for current programme).
4. The elevation of the IAPT scheme as a priority project for the NHS Commissioning Board and Health Education England.
5. The inclusion of a placement in IAPT or Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) for all GPs during training.
6. Increased recruitment to psychiatry to handle the more complex cases of mental illness.
7. Clinical commissioning groups to work closely in partnership with local authorities through Health and Wellbeing boards to ensure that services are joined up and able to proactively support people with complex needs.
8. The Government to undertake a review into funding for outreach mental health services such as assertive outreach and supported living services, with a view to making recommendations for Health and Wellbeing boards to take account of in Joint Strategic Needs Assessments.
9. A new strategy to tackle the ways in which people from certain BME communities come into contact with mental health services to reduce racial inequalities and improve the level of services delivered to these communities.

*Applicability: England.*

*Background briefing: This motion develops and updates policy on mental health provision. Previous policy is set out in the 2010 General Election Manifesto, Change That Works for You, and conference motion Equality and Fairness in Mental Health Provision (2008).*

*Federal Conference Committee accepted a drafting amendment to insert "700,000" in place of "7 million" in b).*

Conference voted in support of an amendment which:

- i) *Inserted the words from "Conference also notes the high prevalence..." to "...were from BME communities."*

- ii) *Inserted the words from “Conference is also concerned that people...” to “...high cost to the taxpayer.”*
- iii) *In 1 after “IAPT” inserted the words from “whilst continuing to fund other vital...” to “...outside of GP pathways”.*
- iv) *Inserted 7, 8 and 9.*

### **Decent Homes for All (Housing Policy Paper)**

Conference notes with concern that the historic failure to create a sustainable housing model has implications, not just on individuals and families, but on the wider economy and jobs market. In particular:

- I. The failure to build enough houses is making home-buying increasingly unaffordable and forcing rents higher and higher.
- II. More and more families are facing the instability of short-term leases in the private rented sector, and too many tenants are suffering the consequences of bad landlords.
- III. Poor housing is bad for health and holds back achievement in school.
- IV. The rapid increase in rents and the increasing number of people renting privately is putting welfare budgets under intense pressure.

Conference believes the most effective way to put housing on a sustainable footing in the future is to give more power and control to: those trapped in poor housing and short tenancies; small organisations, cooperatives, companies and individuals wanting to build but held back by corporate land-banking and lack of land and finance; and local communities and councils.

Conference endorses policy paper 104, *Decent Homes for All*, and its key priorities to:

- A. Build more homes, providing environmentally sustainable homes where people need them, helping with jobs and with kick-starting the economy.
  - B. Give tenants more power and security, making social landlords more accountable and improving standards and security in the rapidly growing private rented sector.
  - C. Ensure more local control, giving local councils, communities and individuals more power and autonomy to create thriving neighbourhoods in the face of the hugely diverse range of challenges that they face.
1. Conference calls for action to deliver our priority in building more homes, particularly to:
- a) Stimulate a major programme of house building, increasing the rate of construction until we reach at least 300,000 houses a year, using untapped sources of finance and giving more freedom to social landlords, local authorities and local communities.
  - b) Take radical steps to improve land supply, through releasing public land with ‘build now, pay later’ deals.
  - c) Tackle ‘landbanking’ through ‘Community Land Auctions’, ‘use it or lose it’ planning permissions and a competition review of the major builders.
  - d) Require, wherever possible, all government-owned housing to undergo energy efficiency improvement through the Green Deal by 2018, and all registered

providers by 2025 – and bringing environmental standards to current levels whenever planning permission is extended.

2. Conference calls for further action to give tenants more power and security, including to:
  - a) Increase protection for private tenants, promoting new longer tenancies and access to a housing ombudsman.
  - b) Give social housing tenants an even stronger role in how their providers are run – with tougher standards of accountability enforced by the Social Housing Regulator. We will also give tenants the power to vote to change their social housing provider and have their stock transfer to another provider willing to receive them.
  - c) Ensure a stronger role for the Social Housing Regulator, giving them the power to proactively cover 'consumer' standards, reintroducing a programme of inspections.
  - d) Reduce restrictions on the power of local authorities to set up comprehensive or targeted licensing schemes in any area they deem appropriate; establish a national licensing system for managing agents; and promote longer tenancies.
  
3. Conference calls for more local control over housing policy, including to:
  - a) Give local authorities greater ability to control second homes, not just in rural areas, but also in areas such as central London – where increasing numbers of homes are bought by overseas investors and left empty.
  - b) Improve powers to tackle the blight of empty homes, giving local communities, housing associations and individuals a greater role in refurbishing them and bringing them back into use, and providing loans for private individuals to renovate an empty property, repaid through rent or sale, and reducing VAT on renovation.
  - c) Encourage more flexible local planning through optional use classes that allow greater control of second homes and private rented accommodation.
  - d) Allow social housing providers (including local authorities) to vary rents based on a tenant's ability to pay, on a sliding scale up to market rent levels for those on the highest incomes.
  - e) Give local authorities the power to incentivise the development of under-used and vacant developable land, particularly in urban areas, through a Vacant Land Tax on a site-value basis, levied no sooner than twelve months after planning consent has been granted.
  
4. Conference calls on Liberal Democrat Ministers to press within government to:
  - a) Protect the principle of, and reaffirm its preference for, mixed communities, comprising social and private housing, across the UK as diversification within a community has clear benefits in improving social cohesion, integration and the sustainability of communities.
  - b) Reject the recommendations of the Policy Exchange report published in August 2012, *Ending Expensive Social Tenancies*, which suggested that councils and housing associations should sell off their social housing stock in high value areas and replace this stock with properties in areas where land is cheaper.

Conference notes with concern the government decision to give developers a Section 106 holiday from building affordable housing in cases where this requirement is preventing development.

Conference further notes that:

- i) Financial viability appraisals submitted to planning authorities by developers which state the case for the financial viability of a site are confidential and are unable to be scrutinised by the public.
- ii) There are many cases where developers have attempted to claim that Section 106 obligations make sites unviable and this claim has subsequently been demonstrated to be false.
- iii) Financial viability appraisals are often published in the course of planning appeals.
- iv) The Section 106 holiday has the potential to further lower the transparency and accountability of developers who claim that they are unable to provide affordable housing as part of their developments by giving them a route to challenge local authorities decisions outside of the planning appeals process.

Conference calls on the coalition government to ensure that all financial appraisals of developments submitted by developers are published in cases where a developer wishes to take advantage of the Section 106 holiday.

Conference also calls on the Government to bring forward proposals to improve financial transparency in all planning applications for developments which are subject to Section 106 agreements or the community infrastructure levy.

*Applicability: England, except the change to VAT in 3 b) which is Federal.*

*Background briefing: This motion and the accompanying policy paper substantially develop and update policy on housing, particularly in the areas of increasing housing supply, improving the quality of the private and social rented sectors, and giving communities more control over local housing policy. Previous policy is set out in the 2010 General Election Manifesto, Change that Works for You, and conference motion Affordable Housing in Safer, Greener Communities (2005).*

*Conference voted for 2. d) instead of an option which read "d) Require all private landlords to obtain a license from their local authority, with national minimum standards for licensing and additional standards to be implemented at the local authority's discretion; establish a national licensing system for managing agents; and promote longer tenancies."*

*Conference voted in support of an amendment to insert 3. e).*

*Conference voted in support of an amendment to add 4. a) and b).*

*Conference voted in support of an amendment to insert after 4. b) the words from, "Conference notes with concern", to, "or the community infrastructure levy."*

*Conference voted to retain the words, "and private rented accommodation.", at the end of 3. c).*

### ***Developing a Future - Policies for Science and Research***

Conference notes that:

- A. The UK spends less than 2% of GDP on research and development, less than it did in the 1980s and significantly less than OECD and G7 averages.
- B. OECD analyses suggest that public investment in research and development pulls in private sector investment, rather than crowding it out.
- C. Despite historically poor funding, the UK has performed extremely well in research outputs, whether measured in academic papers published or in key inventions and discoveries.
- D. It is very hard to predict at the outset what the impact of blue-skies research will be - the Internet, lasers, and monoclonal antibodies have had huge, unpredictable benefits.
- E. There is a shortage of people entering and remaining in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) careers, particularly women and those from poorer socio-economic backgrounds.
- F. Research and development are global activities, with people and ideas from around the world being needed for successful progress.

Conference believes that:

- I. Investment in research and development is critical to the current and future economic success of the UK.
- II. Curiosity in the way the world works is to be encouraged for its own sake, to build deeper understanding, as well as for economic growth.
- III. If we are to keep the brightest and the best in UK science and research, we need to:
  - a) Ensure that STEM subjects are well taught in schools and universities.
  - b) Ensure that academic and research careers are fulfilling and well supported.
  - c) Ensure that immigration rules do not place arbitrary barriers in the way of skilled individuals coming to or remaining in the UK.
- IV. Policymaking should be evidence-based, and scientific advice into policy making should be impartial and independent.

Conference calls on the Coalition Government to ensure that:

- 1. The Government science budget is ring-fenced, for both revenue and capital expenditure. We aim to increase the ring-fenced science budget by 3% above inflation for 15 years, and will seek to arrange a cross-party consensus to deliver this over such a timescale.
- 2. Encouragement is provided for research investment by industry, charities, and the EU.
- 3. Maximum use is made of EU research funding and mobility opportunities.
- 4. 'Blue-skies' research continues to be well funded, in parallel to applied research, and that political interference in science funding decisions is avoided.
- 5. Specialist science teachers are available in all schools, with funded continuous professional development entitlements.
- 6. Immigration laws are revised to ensure that bona fide international students can continue to come to the UK to study, that the best and the brightest can stay in the UK, work and settle after graduation, and that special provision is made for academics, scientists and other chartered individuals to work and settle in the UK.
- 7. An income-contingent loan scheme is established for post-graduate students, so that they do not have to pay the cost of their courses up-front.
- 8. The Liberal Democrat commitment to basing public policy on evidence of the highest

standard is strengthened by endorsing the framework for using randomised controlled trials (RCTs) of public policy published in the Cabinet Office paper *Test, Learn, Adapt*.

9. Open Access publications and Open Data principles become the norm for publicly funded research.

*Applicability: Federal, except 4 and 6 which are England only.*

*Background briefing: This motion substantially updates and develops policies on science and research & development. Although the subject was addressed in the 2010 General Election Manifesto, Change that Works for You, and a number of motions including policy paper 90, Investing in Talent, Building the Economy (2009), the party's last comprehensive statement on science policy was in Science and Survival (1991).*

*Federal Conference Committee accepted a drafting amendment which inserted 3 and 8.*

### **Early Years**

Conference notes that:

- A. The first few years of a child's life can be hugely important for their personal, academic and physical development.
- B. The average annual cost for childcare for a child under two is between £5,000 and £15,000.
- C. An estimated 38% of parents have considered quitting their jobs due to the cost of childcare.
- D. Six out of ten two-year-olds from the poorest 40% of families do not experience any formal early education – compared to just three out of ten in the richest fifth of families.
- E. The excellent work done by Liberal Democrat Ministers within the Coalition Government and Department for Education to increase the amount of free early years education available to all 3-4 year olds; extend early years provision to disadvantaged 2 year olds; and increase the flexibility for all parents to claim this free provision at the times most convenient to them.
- F. Children in multiple birth households are more likely to be in a low-income, working household ('in work poverty' for short) than other children, and that the rate at which mothers of multiples return to work is slower when compared to others.
- G. Parents of multiple birth children experience greater financial hardship than other families; for example, the cost of childcare for multiple households is generally double that of households with one pre-school age child.

Conference believes that:

- i) Childcare remains too large a financial burden, particularly on those families who are having to manage on low to middle incomes, but it is vital that any policies to address this do not reduce quality.
- ii) Current childcare arrangements do not take people who work anti-social hours properly into consideration.
- iii) The Government should do more to ensure that people from all communities are aware of their free early years entitlements and are encouraged to take them up.
- iv) The best early years settings involve parents in their work with young children.

In the short term, conference calls for:

- a) The Government actively to encourage the registration of more childminders.
- b) The Government to continue to assess, and if needs be amend, regulations in order to allow more flexibility over how parents utilise the free entitlement and commission an independent report into improving the flexibility of childcare provision; this should include examining ways in which the Government could improve child care provision for shift workers and those with anti-social hours.
- c) A feasibility study on combining the disparate elements of child care support including the free entitlement, the child care element of Working Tax Credits/Universal Credit and Child Care Vouchers; such a study should examine ways of combining the three elements into one comprehensive child care support mechanism.
- d) A feasibility study into a 'Nursery Premium' to provide additional funding for the early education of young children who would meet Free School Meal criteria in order to improve the quality and affordability of childcare in deprived areas which directly serves lower-income families and those who have special needs.
- e) A feasibility study to consider ways in which parents of multiples (twins, triplets or more) could be supported to return to work earlier through additional childcare vouchers or tax credits.
- f) Conduct an inclusion campaign to ensure that all communities are accessing the Free Entitlement; this should particularly focus on deprived areas and communities which have traditionally not utilised current provision.
- g) A study of best practice in other EU countries to see what lessons can be learned that would allow high quality childcare at lower costs, in particular by changing the mandatory ratios of child carers to children.

In the long term, conference calls for:

1. As finances allow, an emphasis on increasing further the Early Years Entitlement, both by extending it to more two-year-olds and increasing the total number of hours towards a goal of 20 hours.
2. Improving links between the independent, voluntary and maintained sectors early years facilities to take advantage of the benefits of partnership working in the same way they have been for schools.
3. A programme to gradually increase funding for the Quality Premium of the Graduate Leader Fund to help training Early Years Professionals with the aim of ensuring all nurseries, crèches and other non-school based professional child care facilities have at least one graduate-level worker.
4. In line with the recommendation of the Nutbrown Review 'Foundations for Quality Final Report', individuals with Early Years Professional Status (EYPS) should be able to access routes to obtain Qualified Teacher Status (QTS.)
1. Work towards building a cross-party consensus on properly funding childcare for the future.

*Applicability: England.*

*Background Briefing: This motion builds on previous policies set out in the conference motion Education Credit (2011) and the 2010 General Election Manifesto Change that Works for You. In particular it develops a new proposal for vocational courses.*

*Conference voted in support of an amendment which inserted F, G, f) and 5.*

Conference voted in support of another amendment which inserted g).

### **Equal Citizenship - Supporting Independence for Sick and Disabled People**

Conference notes:

- A. The passage of the Welfare Reform Act, particularly:
  - i) Changes to Employment and Support Allowance (ESA).
  - ii) The introduction of Personal Independence Payments (PIPs) as a replacement for Disability Living Allowance (DLA), which is predicted to reduce working age DLA expenditure by 20% by 2015/16, returning expenditure to 2009/10 levels in real terms.
  - iii) The feeling of exclusion from the welfare reform policy development process amongst the disabled community.
  - iv) The conclusions of the report *Reversing Recovery* on the impact of the Welfare Reform Act.
- B. The adoption of policy motion *Employment and Support Allowance and Work Capability Assessments* by Autumn Federal Conference 2011.
- C. The rise in disability hate crime in recent years as reported in a survey conducted by the disability charity Scope.

Conference welcomes:

- 1. The introduction of Universal Credit, which will means-test ESA based on household income rather than the number of hours a claimant's partner works, reducing the number of claimants receiving no means-tested ESA.
- 2. The independent annual reviews of the Work Capability Assessment (WCA), which determines eligibility for ESA, being conducted by Professor Malcolm Harrington.
- 3. The Government's decision to accept the vast majority of the recommendations made in the first two annual reviews by Professor Harrington.
- 4. The four public consultations held so far on the introduction of PIPs.
- 5. The Government's decision to allocate an additional £15 million to the Access to Work budget as a result of the recommendations of Liz Sayce in her review of specialist disability employment programmes.

Conference believes that:

- a) Society and government have a duty of care towards sick and disabled people and that the goals of government policy must be the empowerment of sick and disabled people in order to tackle and reduce their dependency on others and, fundamentally, to enable them to enjoy full and equal citizenship.
- b) Current welfare policy is failing sick and disabled people and that the Welfare Reform Act does not do enough to remedy this situation.
- c) Sick and disabled people unable to work or unable to find employment should be supported by the welfare system for as long as they are unable to work or find employment and that mechanisms such as the current method of time limiting of contributory ESA are counterproductive and harmful.

- d) Although a variety of organisations, including private sector organisations, have a role to play in formulating DWP policy, the last Labour Government relied too heavily on advice from private companies with a potential financial interest in the outcomes of policies affecting sick and disabled people.
- e) Policies which force sick and disabled people to be dependent on others may prevent them from being able to enjoy equal citizenship and leads to exclusion from society.
- f) Further action by government is required to prevent victimisation of and discrimination against sick and disabled people by employers.
- g) More needs to be done in society as a whole to remove barriers to access to employment, transport and participation as equal citizens.

Conference therefore calls for:

1. An independent review of the impact of the Welfare Reform Act.
2. A review of WCA assessment centres to ensure they have adequate disabled access and easy access by public transport or that mechanisms are in place to provide home visits or alternative assessment venues.
3. The establishment of a public consultation on the assessment mechanisms for DLA, ESA and PIPs, with special emphasis on eligibility for support for those with time-variant conditions.
4. The results of this consultation to be used by the DWP to reform its sickness and disability policies.
5. Additional support and effort to be targeted at enabling sick and disabled people to remain in work and at removing barriers of access to work through expansion of schemes such as the Access to Work Fund.
6. The Government to ensure that it continues to take a balanced approach to the advice it receives, and that it prioritises the advice of organisations representing sick and disabled people.
7. The Citizen's Advice and non-profit making advice services to receive increased government funding during the transitional periods for any future substantial changes to the welfare system.
8. The Government to examine the impact of means-testing and income-related support elements of disability welfare policy and, when funds allow, to reform policy to reduce the number of cases where sick and disabled people are made dependent on partners and carers and to ensure that, where this does happen, this does not lead to exclusion from society.
9. A public awareness campaign to tackle prejudice and other attitudes detrimental to the well-being of sick and disabled people.
10. Liberal Democrats in Government to resist, in all spending review decisions that take place within the remainder of this Parliament, any further cuts to welfare expenditure which may fall disproportionately on the incomes, independence and well-being of sick and disabled people.

*Applicability: Federal*

*Background briefing: This motion updates previous policy set out in conference motion Employment and Support Allowance and Work Capability Assessments (2011).*

*Conference voted in support of an amendment which added 10.*

## ***Generating Growth and Jobs in a Time of Austerity***

Conference recognises that the difficult decisions taken by the Coalition Government have ensured the credibility of the UK government's position in the financial markets allowing the UK to borrow at record low rates but also recognises that there remain clear challenges for the generation of more jobs and growth in the economy.

Conference therefore welcomes recent announcements detailing the Coalition Government's plans to use the country's hard-won fiscal credibility to kick start growth and jobs in the short term and to boost the green economy, including:

- I. The Funding for Lending Scheme, worth up to £80bn, which uses the low interest rate on UK Government debt to reduce funding costs for banks and building societies, enabling them to make more – and cheaper – loans to businesses.
- II. A £9.4bn package to invest in the rail industry, making rail travel faster, more reliable, less crowded and greener.
- III. The UK Guarantees scheme, which is designed to: unlock £40bn worth of stalled investment projects; lend up to £6bn to public private infrastructure projects; and boost UK exports through a £5bn refinancing facility.
- IV. The Renewables Obligation, unlocking up to £25bn of new investment in renewable electricity and its supply chain.

Conference remains concerned by:

- A. The lack of competition in the banking sector, which penalises consumers and businesses.
- B. The refusal of the Conservatives to acknowledge that investing in carbon reducing technologies has the potential to make an important contribution to long-term growth; in particular, Conference condemns the repeated attempts by the Chancellor to inhibit growth in renewable energy, currently one of the UK's most successful industries.
- C. The failure of successive governments to tackle the housing crisis.
- D. Irresponsible calls for policies with no clear evidence of effectiveness, such as introducing no-fault dismissal, where the evidence suggests this would weaken confidence further.

Conference calls on the Coalition Government to do everything possible to stimulate growth within its fiscal mandate, including to:

1. Foster a diverse banking system in the UK, including through developing community banking, credit unions, peer-to-peer lending and other non-bank finance.
2. Stimulate green growth in the economy and create framework where there is greater certainty and confidence among businesses to invest in renewable energy, including by:
  - a) Expanding the Green Investment Bank's scale and remit as fast as possible, including relaxing the restriction on its ability to borrow before total public sector debt begins to fall.
  - b) Establishing a target range of 50-100g of CO<sub>2</sub> per kwh for the decarbonisation of power sector by 2030 in addition to existing carbon emission reductions.
  - c) Giving energy efficiency equal value to energy supply, to access the huge potential for energy efficiency.

- d) Scrapping the review in 2014 of the fourth carbon budget target imposed by the Chancellor, thereby establishing long-term certainty for investors in low-carbon technology and infrastructure.
3. Use the government's balance sheet to support investment in housing, including in the owner-occupier, social and private rented sectors.
4. Raise the personal allowance on income tax to £10,000 in the next budget to stimulate consumer demand.
5. Rule out making changes to employment law without clear, robust evidence that the changes will protect employees and support job creation.

*Applicability: Federal.*

*Background briefing: This motion substantially updates policy in light of recent government economic policy announcements including the Funding for Lending Scheme and the UK Guarantees scheme.*

*Conference voted against an amendment which would have deleted the words from "Conference recognises that" to "green economy, including:" and inserted, "Conference acknowledges that there are many difficult decisions that still have to be made by the UK government in order to enable the UK economy to generate new jobs and recover from past economic failures. Conference also notes that it would be a mistake to attribute record low public sector borrowing costs to accelerated fiscal consolidation rather than to a flight to relative safety.*

*Conference therefore welcomes announcements by the Coalition Government which signal a change of direction in economic policy and are intended to stimulate the UK economy and promote employment as well as contribute to the development of a more sustainable economy, including:"*

*After 3 it would have inserted the words, "Conference also calls on the Coalition to adopt further measures, which reflect established party policy, aimed at supporting economic recovery in the UK and striking a fairer balance in the UK economy between rich and poor, including measures to:"*

*This amendment would have deleted "within its fiscal mandate" and relabeled 4. as i), and relabeled 5. as ii).*

*Conference voted to support an amendment which:*

1. *After "growth" in B, inserted the words from "; in particular..." to, "...UK's most successful industries".*
2. *Replaced the words, "2. a) Strengthening the Green Investment Bank and sticking to the promise of giving it borrowing powers once the national debt is falling as a proportion of GDP", with the existing words.*
3. *Inserted 2. c) and d).*

## ***Getting the Most Out of Schools***

Conference notes:

1. The increase in pupil premium funding to £2.5 billion by 2015 and the positive help this money will provide to schools to narrow the attainment gap between the poorest and richest pupils.
2. The increase in per-pupil premium funding to £600 in 2012/13.
3. That vocational courses are an important part of the curriculum.
4. The value of careers guidance to pupils of the ages 10-11 and face-to-face careers advice for pupils aged 13-14, as outlined in the Hughes Report.
5. That the stakeholder model of governing bodies was retained in the Education Act 2011.

Conference believes that:

- I. The policies of the Liberal Democrats in government will have a positive effect on narrowing the attainment gap between the richest and poorest pupils.
- II. The most vulnerable children deserve the highest quality of care.
- III. Diagnostic testing is an invaluable tool for helping teachers to identify both abilities and learning difficulties.
- IV. Early diagnosis would hugely reduce the 20% currently reported as failing to reach an adequate standard of literacy and numeracy at age eleven.
- V. Vocational education has wrongly and for too long been held in low esteem.
- VI. The stakeholder model of governing bodies of community schools ensures local democratic accountability which is not wholly present in other types of publicly funded schools, notably academies and free schools.

With respect to the Pupil Premium, conference calls for:

- A. The Government to chart the impact of the Pupil Premium in narrowing the achievement gap between well-off and poor pupils.
- B. Schools to continue to have the freedom to decide how to spend Pupil Premium funding, for example on out of schools learning such as extra tuition or supplementary schools.
- C. The introduction of measures to deal with schools which are entitled to large amounts of Pupil Premium funding, but which fail to show an improvement in outcomes for those children whom the Pupil Premium was intended.

To improve vocational education, conference calls for:

- i) Clear pathways to be developed for those undertaking vocational courses so that they remain a legitimate and valued alternative to academic courses.
- ii) All students to be offered the free choice to take both academic and vocational courses, as the student sees fit.
- iii) The government to open a tender process to develop and implement a programme to improve parental involvement in schools, which should lead to the establishment of best practice and some localised pilots.
- iv) Technical and vocational education, whether at Further Education colleges or University Technical Colleges, to be able to lead onto appropriate university courses or high-quality industrial apprenticeships and to be fairly funded.

- v) Industry and commerce to be actively involved in developing vocational qualifications; we need to ensure that such qualifications are acceptable internationally so that holders can, for example, find work in other EU countries.
- vi) The Government to encourage young people to consider the education, training and career development opportunities available across the European Union, for example, through the EU lifelong Learning Programme or bilateral partnerships between education institutions and industry.
- vii) Engagement of relevant appropriate private sector employers to provide a career path for students achieving low grades.
- viii) A vocational equivalent to the EBacc.

In the short term conference also calls for:

- a) The assessment of pupils leaving primary education to be carried out through both internal and external procedures, and results made available to those pupils' parents, the secondary school to which they will transfer, OFSTED and the Department for Education.
- b) Provision of age-appropriate careers advice from age 10-11 and face-to-face careers advice for all from age 13-14, as recommended in the Hughes Report.
- c) New school buildings to be able to accommodate children with special needs on the same site as other children, to make joint activities easier where that is what parents choose for their child.
- d) All school governors to have initial mandatory training, all paid clerks to be accredited with appropriate training, and a change in the law so that all publicly-funded schools are required to have all stakeholders represented on their governing body and that no one group can have a majority.
- e) A reaffirmation of local authorities' scrutiny roles for all publicly funded schools within their area.

In the long term, conference calls for:

1. Future increases in the Pupil Premium to be targeted at disadvantaged children in early years and primary school settings, while protecting current Pupil Premium funding for Secondary schools.
2. Schools to be encouraged to focus their Pupil Premium on early assessment and addressing special needs.
3. The government to encourage companies to work with pupils while still at school to support them through their studies and develop 'school leaver' programmes similar to graduate training schemes.
4. Support to be offered to schools to form partnerships with former pupils, local businesses and further education providers to provide mentoring for pupils.

*Applicability: England.*

*Background briefing: This motion builds on previous policies set out in the conference motion Education Credit (2011) and the 2010 General Election Manifesto Change that Works for You. In particular it develops a new proposal for vocational courses.*

*Federal Conference Committee accepted a drafting amendment which inserted ii) and v).*

*Conference voted to support an amendment which inserted 5 and VI, d) and e)*

*Conference also voted to support an amendment which inserted the existing a) in place of the original words, which read: "a) Pupils leaving primary education to be tested and assessed through the school's internal procedures, and results made available to those pupils' parents, the secondary school to which they will transfer, OFSTED and the Department for Education".*

### ***Empowering the IPCC***

Conference notes:

- a) That the IPCC was originally set up to restore public confidence in the police, because the police were no longer trusted to investigate themselves.
- b) The increasing difficulties the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) has in investigating police officers and police staff who refuse to be interviewed about complaints.
- c) That such refusals often have serious consequences in incidents where members of the public die and police officers only provide a written statement.
- d) That full and thorough investigations become impossible because efforts to ascertain facts by asking questions are deliberately thwarted.
- e) That this situation will soon be exacerbated as more and more police forces contract out police work to private companies over which the IPCC has no jurisdiction.

Conference believes that creating a fair and just society for all is dependent on the full transparency and co-operation of those the public employs and trusts to protect society.

Conference further believes that the IPCC's practice of delegating most investigations to the police themselves negates the original concept of the IPCC.

Conference calls on the Coalition Government to restore the trust between our police forces and the public they serve by giving the IPCC far stronger powers to:

1. Obtain information from employees of the police services and those to whom their work is sub-contracted.
2. Require police officers and police staff who are the subject of an IPCC investigation following a death to give an account of events, and be compelled to answer questions.
3. Require minimum standards for private contractors with custody or other responsibilities.
4. Ensure all private contractors for police services must adhere to strong and enforceable minimum standards over their operations and checks on their directors, managers and staff; such standards should be determined, regulated, monitored and enforced by the IPCC, including powers to search premises and arrest and question suspects.

Conference further calls on the Coalition Government to ensure that the IPCC ends the practice of delegating to the police investigations into serious complaints, and instead requires the IPCC to investigate such complaints itself and provides the IPCC with adequate resources to do so.

*Applicability: England.*

*Background briefing: This motion creates policy to increase the powers of the IPCC by enabling the IPCC to obtain information from employees of the police services, and by enabling the IPCC to require police staff to attend interviews during investigations involving a death.*

Conference voted to support an amendment which:

1. *Inserted a.*
2. *Inserted the paragraph beginning, "Conference further believes that the IPCC's practice..."*
3. *Inserted the paragraph beginning, "Conference further calls on the Coalition Government to..."*

### ***Fair Pay for Public Sector Workers Across the UK***

Conference notes that:

- A. The Coalition Government is considering the introduction of regional or local pay, which would see variations in the level of pay for public sector workers across the country.
- B. The Chancellor of the Exchequer announced in the 2012 budget that "some departments will have the option of moving to more local pay for those public sector workers whose pay freezes end this year."

Conference is concerned that:

- i) Regional or local pay could adversely affect many regions and nations of the UK especially those with relatively lower incomes or relatively weaker private sectors.
- ii) Regional or local pay could reduce the economic productivity of these areas by reducing the amount of money in the local economy and consequently reducing demand, which would in turn have a detrimental impact on local businesses.
- iii) Regional or local pay risks undermining public services in areas that offered lower rates of pay, as more skilled or experienced public sector workers would be able to compete for higher paying jobs in other regions and as a result there could be a 'brain drain' towards these regions.
- iv) The evidence that there are significant pay differentials between the public and private sector and that consequently public sector pay is crowding out private sector jobs is inconclusive.
- v) Local pay, as distinct from regional pay, could have an equally detrimental impact on the areas affected.

Conference endorses:

- a) The statement by Vince Cable that "We certainly don't want to be in a position where in relatively low income parts of the country, pay is depressed. That would be wrong and inappropriate."
- b) The statement by Nick Clegg that regional pay could "be totally unjust because it would actually penalise people working in some of the most difficult areas."

Conference calls for:

1. The UK Government to rule out any further expansion in regional or local pay.

2. The continuation of national pay agreements for the Public Sector which may include flexibility to let employers solve specific staff recruitment and retention problems.

*Applicability: Federal.*

*Background Briefing: This motion updates party policy on regional and local pay. Previous policy on pay in education is set out in policy paper 89, Equity and Excellence (2009), and on public sector pay in general in policy paper 53, Quality, Innovation, Choice (2002).*

### **Good Food Shouldn't Cost the Earth**

Conference recognises the key roles food production and consumption play in the UK economy, enhancing natural capital and the health of citizens.

Conference believes that all levels of government should promote:

- a) Access for all to affordable and nutritious food.
- b) Healthy eating behaviour.
- c) Measures which encourage individuals to develop the knowledge and skills to make informed choices over food consumption.
- d) Sustainable food production and consumption, minimising negative environmental impacts, both in the UK and abroad.
- e) Respect for animal welfare in food production.

Conference recognises the challenges posed to these aims by global population growth, the impacts of climate change and natural resource depletion.

Conference therefore calls for:

1. Government to adopt a National Food Strategy to secure the production and consumption of sustainable and healthy food, addressing issues of food security, climate change, environmental protection, affordability, nutrition and animal welfare.
2. Policies and measures aimed at promoting healthier and more sustainable diets, including consultation on fiscal measures such as the taxation of heavily sugared drinks.
3. Food and food skills to be included in the school curriculum.
4. Councils encouraged to produce Food Plans aiming to increase food resilience, support local food businesses and help people get involved with food production.
5. Government to use public procurement policy to require healthy and sustainable food for public food contracts.
6. Government to work with industry and retailers to encourage the universal uptake of the 'traffic light' colour-coding system for nutritional labelling, and to work towards more consistent sustainability labelling for fish products.
7. Government to publish a coherent framework for reducing greenhouse gas emissions from agriculture in line with the targets set by the Climate Change Act.
8. Measures to be taken to promote small and mixed farms, recognising the benefits they deliver to rural communities and the environment; and an independent review of the behavioural, welfare, socio-economic and environmental impacts of large-scale farming.
9. Government to set a target date for zero food waste to landfill.
10. A levy on plastic bags with the money raised supporting community food initiatives.

*Applicability: England, except 1, 5 and 7 which are Federal.*

*Background briefing: This motion develops and updates previous policies set out in the 2010 General Election Manifesto, Change that Works for You, policy paper 93 Our Natural Heritage (2009) and conference motion Hungry for Change (2004). In particular it creates new policy for a levy on plastic bags.*

*Federal Conference Committee accepted a drafting amendment which inserted the words, "all levels of", after the words, "Conference believes that", and replaced the word "Cities" in 4 with the word "Councils".*

*Conference voted to remove the words, "including adopting a timetable to achieve a minimum of 30 per cent organic food." which were originally at the end of 5.*

### **Holding Banks to Account**

Conference recognises the manipulation of LIBOR rates by leading banks as yet another example of banks and bankers operating a system for their benefit at the expense of the wider economy.

Conference believes a system in which bankers are held personally responsible for misdeeds is necessary to ensure strong and health banks, trusted by customers, supports the UK economy. In addition, leading economists have identified the lack of available domestic credit as a serious barrier to renewed growth in the UK economy.

In light of the ongoing LIBOR setting scandal, Conference calls for:

- A. The necessary resources to be made available to the Serious Fraud Office to prosecute, to the full extent, suspected breaches of the law by bankers.
- B. The necessary resources to be made available to the Financial Services Authority to impose the maximum possible penalties on banks for regulatory breaches and particularly on individual bankers found to have breached the trust of their customers.
- C. Liberal Democrats to fully support for the work of the Wheatley Review, reviewing the workings of LIBOR setting.
- D. Liberal Democrat parliamentarians to continue their support for the Parliamentary Commission on Banking Standards to do everything in its power to improve banking standards and to establish what measures must be taken to ensure a flow of credit to individuals and SMEs in the UK economy.
- E. The Coalition Government to consider establishing a professional body of bankers to ensure best practices are followed across the industry.

Conference furthermore calls for:

1. Banks to increase net lending, including making use of Funding for Lending scheme introduced by the Coalition Government.
2. The Coalition Government to ensure banks follow a transparent and consistent lending decision-making process, as set out in Policy Paper 105 on Sustainable Prosperity and Jobs.
3. Liberal Democrat MPs to support constituents whose businesses have been refused credit by writing to banks to seek an explanation for their refusal to lend and to report instances of unfair lending decisions to the Parliamentary Commission on Banking Standards.

*Applicability : Federal*

*Background briefing: This motion creates new policy in relation to the recent scandal about manipulation of LIBOR rates.*

### ***International Cooperation on the Environment***

Conference notes the progress made as a result of:

- A. The Renewable Energy Directive which mandates that 20% of energy in Europe will come from renewable sources from 2020 and which has seen UK renewable energy increase to 3.8% of production earlier this year.
- B. The Climate Change Act which places strict limits on carbon emissions, under our carbon budgets, and is driving the Government to decarbonise the economy.
- C. The UN Framework for the Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) which paved the way for international cooperation to reduce green house gas emissions.
- D. The Kyoto Protocol agreed under the UNFCCC, which saw developed countries commit to reduce their green house gas emissions by 5.2% by 2012.
- E. The Convention on Biological Diversity, which acknowledges the importance of biodiversity, recognises it as a key pillar of development, and is dedicated to promoting sustainable development; and the Nagoya Protocol, agreed at the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, which sets targets for protecting the natural environment.
- F. The Convention on the International Trade in Endangered Species, a vital tool in the protection of plants and animals at risk from the international wildlife trade, including tigers, elephants and coral.

Conference notes with regret:

- i) The lack of agreement under the UNFCCC on a comprehensive, legally binding agreement to apply from 2012.
- ii) The failure of EU Governments to adopt a target to reduce emissions by 30% by 2020.
- iii) The failure of EU Governments to put in place a 'Low Carbon Roadmap'.
- iv) The failure of the European Trading Scheme to create a sufficiently high carbon price and the failure of EU Governments to reform it.
- v) The unprecedented scale of biodiversity loss the world is experiencing, in spite of the current international agreements: more needs to be done.

Conference congratulates Liberal Democrat Coalition Ministers and MEPs on helping to secure:

- a) The European Energy Efficiency Directive which will ensure more than 17% improved energy efficiency in 2020.
- b) Agreement to a roadmap to negotiate a Legal Binding Agreement at COP 17 in Durban.
- c) Agreement at Rio+20, to develop Sustainable Development Goals; broader measures of progress to complement GDP to allow countries to measure their natural wealth and social wellbeing; and recognition of the importance of the role of business sustainability reporting.
- d) £2.9bn funding to 2015 for an international climate fund to support adaptation and low carbon development and effective forest management in developing countries.

Conference urges the Coalition Government to:

1. Push other European member states to adopt a target to reduce emissions by 30% by 2020 as set out in the 'Programme for Government'.
2. Continue to push for reform of the European Emissions Trading Scheme.
3. Show leadership and ensure that a set of indicators is agreed at the meeting of the UN Convention on Biodiversity, Hyderabad in October 2012, to measure progress on biodiversity.
4. Work with other countries, especially the G77 and emerging economies, and listen to the voices of the poorest in to developing Sustainable Development Goals focussing on food, energy, and water – important for growth, poverty eradication and sustainability; these must be universal and aspirational, build on the success of the Millennium Development Goals and should be an integral part of the post-2015 development framework.
5. Work with other members of UNFCCC, and crucially as a driving member of the EU, to secure further progress at COP18 in Qatar towards negotiating a legally binding climate change agreement by 2015 to take effect by 2020 and implementing the commitments made in Durban.
6. Work through the EU to phase out the production and consumption of hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs; the fastest growing category of greenhouse gases), by adopting an ambitious revised EU F-Gas Regulation, including a ban on new HFC-containing equipment no later than 2030, and by seeking to include HFCs in the control schedules of the Montreal Protocol.

*Applicability: Federal.*

*Background briefing: This motion updates previous policy on international environmental negotiations as set out in the 2010 General Election Manifesto, Change that Works for You, and conference motion Energy and Climate Change (2009).*

*Conference voted in support of an amendment to insert 6.*

### ***Medically Assisted Dying***

Conference notes that:

- a) A significant minority of people who suffer unendurably from medical conditions that offer no hope of recovery are physically unable to end their lives at a time of their own choosing without assistance.
- b) It is over 50 years since the passage of the 1961 Suicide Act established the current legislative framework, but that scores of British citizens now travel to Switzerland each year to seek medical assistance to die.
- c) Legislation making provision for medically assisted dying, and incorporating many safeguards to prevent misuse, was enacted in Belgium and the Netherlands a decade ago and continues to enjoy very strong public support in those countries.
- d) There is continuing debate on the subject in the United Kingdom, and the evidence of successive opinion polls demonstrates very strong public support for similar legislation here.

Conference reaffirms the policy it adopted in the conference motion *Medically Assisted Dying* in 2004 in support of legislation providing for medical assistance to die to be available

to patients in particular circumstances, subject to rigorous safeguards to prevent abuse. Conference also recognises the importance of high quality palliative care being available to all who may need it, and of greater support for carers.

Conference calls for Liberal Democrat ministers:

1. To press for the introduction of a government bill on the subject, allowing Parliament the opportunity to consider, as a minimum, the legalisation of those who are terminally ill to have assistance to die with dignity, subject to safeguards.
2. In the event of a Bill being introduced through Private Members' procedures, to press for time to be made available in the House of Commons to enable it to be fully considered.

Conference believes that any such legislative proposal should be determined by way of a free vote in order to respect the freedom of conscience of Parliamentarians.

*Applicability: England and Wales.*

*Background Briefing: This motion updates policy on medically assisted dying. Previous policy can be found in conference motion Medically Assisted Dying (2004).*

*Conference voted in support of an amendment which after the word, "subject", inserted the words beginning, "allowing Parliament the opportunity to".*

*Conference voted against an amendment which would have:*

1. Deleted the words beginning with, "Conference reaffirms...", to the words, "...prevent abuse."
2. Deleted the words beginning, "Conference calls for Liberal Democrat ministers:", to the words ending, "freedom of conscience of Parliamentarians."
3. Stated that the issues of Euthanasia and Assisted Suicide should be conscience issues, on which the party takes no position.
4. Requested for a royal commission on this issue.

### ***Mutuals, Employee Ownership, and Workplace Democracy Policy Paper***

Conference recalls that Liberal Democrats have always believed in helping individuals to take and use power, enabling them to be involved in the decisions which affect their lives.

Conference believes that employee participation in the workplace, together with wider employee ownership, is important for diffusing economic power; promoting enterprise; increasing job satisfaction; and improving service to customers.

Conference therefore welcomes policy paper 106, *Mutuals, Employee Ownership, and Workplace Democracy*, and affirms that:

- A. Every individual has the right to play a meaningful role in society regardless of their occupation, wealth, gender, age, role, or position.
- B. Every person should have a sense of self-worth about the work that they do and the skills that they use.

- C. Participation as well as choice and competition have an important role in empowering individuals and driving economic efficiency.
- D. Individuals should have a say in the way that they live their lives, including where and how they work.
- E. Liberal Democrats believe that democracy, participation, and the co-operative principle are fundamental both to individual rights and the successful operation of the economy.

Conference welcomes the work being done by Liberal Democrat ministers in government to further this agenda, and endorses the policy paper; conference in particular supports its calls for:

1. Making mutuals, employee-owned, and employee-share-owned businesses (MEESOs) a more viable business option through:
  - a) Establishing a formal, legal structure for the holding of employee shares.
  - b) Removing adverse tax consequences for companies which wish to transfer shares to Employee Benefit Trusts.
  - c) Giving discounts on capital gains tax for business owners who transfer a significant stake in the business to employees.
2. Giving employees a greater say over their own working environments by:
  - a) Enshrining in legislation workers' rights to participation in organisations with over 250 employees.
  - b) Giving employees in companies where employees own at least 5% of shares the right to elect a member to the board.
  - c) Amending Companies Act legislation to allow the option of a two-tier board structure similar to the German model.
3. Increasing the number of employees benefiting from ownership schemes by:
  - a) Giving employees in publicly-listed companies with more than 250 employees the right to request an all-employee share scheme covering at least 5% of the shares.
  - b) Providing for employees to submit a bid for up to 100% ownership of a business at the point of sale.
  - c) Requiring that all Initial Public Offerings on the London Stock Exchange offer at least 5% of shares to employees at a discounted rate.
4. Increasing government support for the MEESO sector through:
  - a) The nomination of a Minister in the Department for Business, Innovation, and Skills with particular responsibility for the MEESO sector.
  - b) Ensuring that all legislation and regulation creates a level playing field for MEESOs to compete with other forms of business ownership.
  - c) Working to encourage employee involvement in the public and voluntary sectors.

*Applicability: Federal.*

*Background briefing: This motion substantially develops policy on mutuals, employee ownership and workplace democracy by building on previous policy set out in conference*

*motion A New Purpose Politics (2011) and the 2010 General Election Manifesto, Change that Works for You.*

*Conference voted against an amendment which would have replaced 3. a) with the words "Giving employees in publicly-listed companies with more than 250 employees the right to require an all-employee share scheme covering 5% of the shares if more than 10% of the employees (or a trade union that represents them) request it."*

### **No Government Above the Law - The Justice and Security Bill**

Conference notes:

- A. The 'secret courts' proposals within the Government's Justice and Security Bill, which would allow Ministers to seek that civil hearings and trials take place in secret, with neither the public nor the other party having the right to see relevant evidence, where national security is at risk of being damaged.
- B. That these proposals for 'Closed Material Procedures' (CMP) did not form part of either the Liberal Democrat or Conservative manifestos in 2010, nor the Coalition Agreement.
- C. Widespread opposition to the proposals, including from the majority of the 'Special Advocates' who would be the lawyers authorised to participate in CMP proceedings, who in their response to the Green Paper described the CMP proposals as "fundamentally unfair".
- D. The Bill's removal from the powers available to the court the 'Norwich Pharmacal' order which permits disclosure of information about the actions of a third party (such as a foreign government) where the UK government had an involvement in the third party's actions and has relevant information, thereby preventing this relevant information from being disclosed.
- E. The success already of Liberal Democrats within Government in:
  - i) Excluding inquests from these proposals.
  - ii) Restricting to their use to cases where 'national security' is at risk, rather than a broader 'public interest' test.
  - iii) Achieving some judicial oversight of Ministerial applications for CMP.
- F. Existing arrangements for handling secret information in court, known as the Public Interest Immunity (PII) system work well, with decisions about sensitive disclosures being made by a judge rather than an interested party, namely a Minister and Government being prevented from relying on evidence that is untested and therefore potentially misleading.

Conference believes that:

- a) It is a fundamental principle of a democracy that no-one shall be above the law.
- b) It is essential for confidence in the UK judicial system, the UK government and the UK security services for justice to be seen to be done via a transparent, fair and open judicial process.
- c) These proposals represent a fundamental challenge to the balance between the Government and citizens in the justice system.
- d) The UK courts should not be banned from disclosing evidence of serious wrongdoing by Britain or its allies, especially where that evidence may be vital to an individual's interests or in holding to account those responsible for serious criminal acts.

- e) These proposals risk further undermining the reputation of British Security Services and damaging public trust and confidence in those Services due to judgments in the CMP handed down in secret, after a trial potentially held entirely behind closed doors from which parties to the litigation other than the Government are excluded.

Conference reaffirms its belief in the importance of the principle of open justice, the right to a fair trial, that transparency is a fundamental aspect of democratic accountability and that Government must not set itself above the law.

Conference calls for:

1. The Coalition Government to withdraw Part II of the Justice and Security Bill; and put in place instead a statutory scheme reflecting the current Public Interest Immunity system to be enacted which will retain judicial discretion, be a proportionate means of ensuring national security is not jeopardised by any litigation, and ensure the working successful democratic principle of open justice is retained.
2. All Liberal Democrats in parliament to press the government to do this and in any event to press for the withdrawal or defeat of Part II of the Justice and Security Bill.

*Applicability: Federal.*

*Background briefing: This motion creates policy in response to the Justice and Security Bill.*

*Conference voted against an amendment which would have replaced 1. and 2. with the words:*

- i) *Secure that the principles of open justice and natural justice are respected and protected.*
- ii) *Ensure that closed material proceedings can only be used as a last resort in cases that would otherwise be incapable of being tried.*
- iii) *Limit the use of closed material to those issues which could not be effectively determined without the use of such material and to the bare minimum necessary to safeguard national security.*

### **Reform of the House of Lords**

Conference believes:

- A. The Liberal Democrats and their forebears can take justifiable pride in their role across the last five centuries in achieving the dispersal of power away from unaccountable individuals to accountable bodies, in the interests of giving all citizens greater control over their own lives.
- B. The principle that those in public authority, such as holders of executive and legislative power, should be chosen by the public is now well established across the world.
- C. The remaining presence in Britain in 2012 of a chamber with the authority to change the law which does not respect this principle is a standing outrage, and an ongoing stain on Britain's ability to preach the values of open, transparent and accountable government to the rest of the world.
- D. That full, democratic reform of the House of Lords is vital to improve the ability of Parliament as a whole to hold the executive to account.
- E. That a reduction in the size of the House of Commons should not go ahead until the

- second chamber has been strengthened by the force of democratic legitimacy.
- F. That meaningful reform of the House of Lords is contingent on the introduction of direct elections to determine its membership.
  - G. That these principles are highly and enduringly popular with the British public.
  - H. The achievement of constitutional reform to bring Britain out of the nineteenth century is and always has been clearly a major basis of Liberal Democrat participation in the present coalition government.
  - I. Failure to implement one major plank of the Coalition programme must necessarily have consequences for other parts of the agreement, in order for a partnership government to operate effectively.

Conference notes:

- i) The Liberal Democrat manifesto at the 2010 General Election committed Liberal Democrats to “replace the House of Lords with a fully-elected second chamber”.
- ii) The Conservative manifesto at the 2010 General Election committed Conservatives to “work to build a consensus for a mainly-elected second chamber to replace the current House of Lords, recognising that an efficient and effective second chamber should play an important role in our democracy and requires both legitimacy and public confidence”.
- iii) The Labour manifesto at the 2010 General Election committed the Labour party to a referendum on its proposal that “At the end of the next Parliament one third of the House of Lords will be elected; a further one third of members will be elected at the general election after that”.

Conference:

- a) Restates once again its commitment to campaigning for the latest liberal change of many down the centuries which have brought greater power and freedom to British citizens – and which is also popular with the British people.
- b) Notes the successful and effective work done by Liberal Democrat peers over the years in improving legislation.
- c) Believes that the useful work which the both the current House of Lords, and many of its individual members, do, can nevertheless not justify the ongoing existence of a major seat of power which is not accountable to the British people.
- d) Is deeply disappointed with the failure of the Conservative party to uphold the Coalition Agreement, by supporting their own Prime Minister and Chancellor of the Exchequer in maintaining the Conservative manifesto commitment to reform of, and elections to, the Lords.
- e) Is equally disappointed by the shameful opportunism of the Labour party in claiming to support reform and elections for the House of Lords in principle, while refusing to support the necessary procedures in Parliament to deliver it in practice.
- f) Regrets that some senior Liberal Democrat peers spoke out against reforms of, and elections to, the House of Lords, a fundamental principle on which they had previously stood for election.

Conference therefore supports Nick Clegg’s decisions to:

- I. Withdraw Liberal Democrat support for proposed boundary changes as a consequence of the Conservative failure to deliver on elections to the House of Lords.
- II. Refuse to waste any government time and effort on minimal reforms such as those

contained in the Steel Bill which do not address the basic lack of democracy in the Lords and indeed would serve only to entrench it.

Conference further calls for:

1. Liberal Democrats to reaffirm our commitment to a directly-elected second chamber in our 2015 General Election manifesto.
2. The implementation, in full, of the Coalition Agreement commitment that appointments to the House of Lords should be made on the basis of ensuring the balance of that House reflects the vote shares received by the political parties in the last General Election.
3. That such appointments should be made to improve gender balance in the Liberal Democrat parliamentary party in the House of Lords, and to reflect the diversity of the country as a whole.
4. All Liberal Democrat members of the House of Lords to support a principle which has been at the heart of Liberal Democrat and Liberal policy since before even any member of the House of Lords was born.
5. All Liberal Democrats appointed to the House of Lords to make a public commitment prior to appointment in support of meaningful democratic reform at every available opportunity.

*Applicability: Federal.*

*Background briefing: This motion updates the previous policies set out in the conference motion Lords Elections by 2015 (2011), and in the 2010 General Election Manifesto Change that Works for You.*

*Conference voted in support of an amendment which:*

- i) *Insert D, E, F and I.*
- ii) *Replaced in G the words, "this view is", with the words, "these principles are".*
- iii) *Inserted d, e and f.*
- iv) *Inserted I and II.*
- v) *Replaced the existing words in 1, 2, 3 and 4 with:*
  1. *The Coalition Government to deliver, by 2015, a second chamber which is wholly or predominantly elected.*
  2. *Measures already outlined in Liberal Democrat policy to ensure that from the start the elected second chamber has a gender balance".*
- vi) *The original 3 was renumbered 5.*

### ***Rehabilitation Revolution***

Conference notes that:

- A. The Government is increasing the role of payment by results in the probation services.
- B. Private companies are not currently subject to Freedom of Information requests.
- C. Prisons like Doncaster are already providing innovative rehabilitation schemes both inside and outside the prison.
- D. The welcome establishment of drug recovery wings in some prisons.

- E. Currently there are approximately 4000 women in prison, two thirds of them serving sentences of less than 12 months.
- F. There is an over-representation of Black and Asian Minority Ethnic (BAME) people in the prison system and yet an under-representation of the BAME community and socio-economic diversity in the judiciary and an ethnic imbalance between prisoners and prison officers.
- G. Sentencing reforms passed in Canada in 1996 explicitly incorporated Restorative Justice Programmes into the sentencing phase of the criminal process resulting in far fewer custodial sentences.
- H. The introduction of Restorative Conferences in Chard and Sheffield has helped bring about drastically reduced reoffending rates.

Conference believes that:

- I. The probation services industry is dominated by a few large companies like Serco and G4S.
- II. Too many illiterate offenders are leaving prison or community service still illiterate and lacking in basic skills.
- III. Prison is not the right vehicle for the rehabilitation of offenders with severe mental health problems, including drug addiction.
- IV. Restorative justice conferences tackle reoffending more effectively than short-term sentences because they ensure that offenders face up to their actions and engage with their communities.

Conference calls for:

- a) A presumption in favour of robust community sentences and restorative justice against ineffective and costly short sentences of up to six months.
- b) The wider incorporation of restorative justice principles into the sentencing process following the Canadian example; that would allow the court, on the application of either party, or of its own motion, to adjourn sentencing for a limited amount of time to allow a restorative justice conference to take place, provided that the victim and offender were willing to engage.
- c) The court to be required to take into account both the outcome of any conference and the willingness or otherwise of an offender to engage with the restorative justice process when determining sentence.
- d) Where restorative justice sentences are available, efforts to increase uptake to show how effective they are.
- e) Providers of probation services to keep records of ex-offenders educational and employment pursuits, to gauge the success of community sentencing.
- f) The government to make sure credit is available to assist small firms in entering the market.
- g) Mandatory rotation of service providers and contract sharing between large and smaller firms and ones as well as charities, cooperatives and voluntary organisations to encourage competition.
- h) Local authorities to have a right to be consulted over the selection on service providers, encouraging localism and preventing the duplication of service provision.
- i) Prisons to be held to the same 'payment by results' rule based on reoffending rates some existing private prisons already operate under – a prison that consistently releases prisoners who go on to re-offend should be held to account.

- j) All companies with a large market share of probation services to be subject to FOI requests.
- k) A strong focus on literacy and life skills within prison and community sentencing.
- l) Judges to visit community sentencing and restorative justice schemes to gauge for themselves their effectiveness.
- m) Further roll-out of Neighbourhood Resolution Panels.
- n) Continued roll-out of Women's Centres across the UK.

In the longer term, conference also calls for:

1. Establishment of a network of Women's Centres and the introduction of a Women's Officer at the National Offender Management Scheme.
2. The establishment of an Institution of Justice Excellence based on the National Institute for Clinical Excellence, to establish and publicise best practice and establish definitions for terms like 'effective punishment'.

*Applicability: England only.*

*Background briefings: This motion develops policy on rehabilitation, building on previous policy set out in conference motion Taking Responsibility (2011), the 2010 General Election Manifesto, Change That Works for You, conference motion Prisons and Criminal Justice Policy (2009) and conference motion Cutting Crime by Catching Criminals (2008).*

*Conference voted in support of an amendment which inserted G, H, f and IV, and inserted the existing b, c and d in place of the words, "b) Efforts to increase uptake in restorative justice sentences where these are available".*

### **Relaxation of Planning Laws**

Conference notes:

- a) The recent announcement by the coalition government of the proposal to relax certain planning laws relating to housing for a three-year period.
- b) That this announcement includes the intention to allow extensions of up to 8m to be permitted development and the proposal to waive rules and existing commitments on affordable housing from proposed housing developments in certain circumstances.

Conference believes:

1. That the current planning laws are not the reason for a failure to proceed with existing approved housing developments.
2. That these proposals go against the spirit of the Localism Act 2011 which encourages more local control of planning policies.
3. That these proposals ignore local democracy, will fail to protect local communities and will encourage more neighbourhood disputes.

Conference therefore calls on the coalition government to withdraw these proposals.

*Applicability: England*

*Background briefing: This motion creates policy in respect of recent government announcements on permitted development rights and section 106 agreements.*

## ***A Sustainable Future for Aviation***

Conference believes that:

- i) The aviation industry is an important driver of jobs and growth in our globalised economy.
- ii) Aviation helps to connect people who live in different countries, and promotes internationalism.
- iii) Aviation has the potential to become one of the greatest threats to the global environment.
- iv) Unmitigated expansion of aviation would cause the UK to miss its carbon reduction targets.
- v) Aviation has a very negative impact on the health and well being of individuals living near UK airports, particularly in terms of noise pollution and air quality.
- vi) Without significant technological development, air travel will become too expensive for the majority of people due to the rising cost of fuel.
- vii) The Government should support and promote efforts by the aviation industry to reduce its environmental impact.
- viii) Aviation policy in the UK has lacked a clear strategy for how we can mitigate its impact on the environment and on local residents.
- ix) Successive Governments have failed to find a means by which we can support this industry, while mitigating its impact on UK residents and the global environment.

Conference therefore welcomes:

- I The Government's decision, in line with our manifesto, to cancel Labour's third runway at Heathrow and to oppose new runways at Gatwick and Stansted.
- II. The publication of the Government's Draft Aviation Policy Strategy.
- III. The Government's continued support for the European Emissions Trading Scheme.

Conference however notes that:

- A. The independent Committee on Climate Change (CCC) recommended that, in order for the UK to meet its target of 80% reduction in emissions by 2050, aviation emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> should not exceed 2005 levels in 2050 (37.5MtCO<sub>2</sub> a year); for this to be possible, air traffic movements should not be allowed to expand more than 60% beyond current levels.
- B. Up to half airports of emissions are caused by surface access to airports.
- C. Heathrow is an extremely badly located airport, with half of all those in Europe affected by aircraft noise living under the Heathrow flight path – we strongly oppose the third runway, and are disappointed that the Labour party do not have a clear policy against it.
- D. London is the best-connected city in the world, with seven runways operating at six airports.
- E. A Thames Estuary airport would be extremely expensive; catastrophic for local wildlife; a dangerous investment due to the location of the SS Richard Montgomery; liable to bird-strike; and poorly located for those living outside London and the South-East.
- F. Aviation policy has to date focused on London and the South-East; it is clear that that is where the greatest demand lies, but airports and foreign travel for business or leisure must be easily accessible for citizens living across the UK.

- G. With Birmingham looking to expand, Stansted only half full and Gatwick expanding into emerging markets, regional airports and other airports within London can meet demand for years to come; however, we recognise that a single, hub airport – rather than a constrained Heathrow with multiple satellite airports – would be better for the environment and better for the economy.
- H. The Government has announced an independent Commission to identify ‘options for maintaining this country’s status as an international hub for aviation’, and welcomes the commitment from the Government ‘to take full account of the social, environmental and other impacts of any expansion in airport capacity’.

Conference therefore calls for:

1. Rejection of new runways at Heathrow, Stansted or Gatwick.
2. Rejection of all plans to build an airport in the Thames Estuary
3. Rejection of mixed-mode at Heathrow, and end night flights between 23.00 and 06.00 except for emergencies.
4. Rejection of expansion of airport capacity which would allow for aircraft movements above the cap set by the CCC, or which would allow for a net increase in the number of runways which serve the UK; we would introduce an overall emissions cap for the industry for 2050 in line with the CCC recommendations.
5. UK Aviation policy to be based on five key principles:
  - a) Accessibility from North and South.
  - b) Growth within UK carbon budgets.
  - c) Minimal impact to local population.
  - d) Minimal impact to the local environment.
  - e) Maximum hubbing potential.
6. The UK to make best use of existing capacity through:
  - a) Movement of point-to-point flights which do not serve our hub capability from Heathrow to other airports; this would be done through a re-negotiation of EU slot allocation rules and the introduction of slot auctioning – failing that, we support the introduction of a departure tax at Heathrow to shift less profitable non-hub flights.
  - b) An end to cross-subsidy of lower landing fees at Heathrow.
  - c) The introduction of a Per-Plane-Duty (PPD) in place of APD to incentivise fully-loaded planes; in the mean time, we support a revenue neutral shift in APD rates to discourage short-haul flights, which can be made on land, and to encourage long-haul hubbing - APD and PPD rates should be based on distance to airports, not to capital cities.
  - d) Use of existing capacity and improved transport links at Gatwick, Stansted, Luton, Manchester, Birmingham and Edinburgh – the priority should be better use of capacity at Gatwick, which has already shown the ability to access emerging markets across Asia through new point-to-point routes.
7. Greening of the aviation industry through:
  - a) New noise limits in population centres at certain times to incentivise quieter planes.

- b) Tough requirements for low emission surface access to UK airports, and for airport operators to use low emission vehicles on site.
  - c) Support for the Emissions Trading Scheme at the EU level to promote the polluter pays principle.
8. The Commission's report and the response to it to be based on the five key principles set out in 4 above, and to include:
- a) A strategy for removing excess capacity above the CCC cap outside of the new hub airport should one be identified.
  - b) No net increase in the number of runways which serve the South-East of England.
  - c) Greater recognition of the need to serve North and South than previous governments have shown.
  - d) Significantly lower noise impact than currently exists at Heathrow.
  - e) Proposals for low carbon public transport access to any new hub airport, should one be identified.

*Applicability: Federal.*

*Background briefing: This motion ensures that policy finds a balance between recognising The UK's aviation needs while still meeting its carbon reduction targets. It also seeks to ensure that transport is easily accessible across the UK and does not continue to be overly focused on London and the South East. The motion updates the previous policies set out in the 2010 General Election Manifesto Change that Works for You, and the conference motion Tackling the UK Airport Crisis (2002).*

*Federal Conference Committee accepted a drafting amendment which:*

- i) *In B after "half of", inserted the word, "airports", and deleted the words, "relating to air travel".*
- ii) *Inserted H.*
- iii) *Inserted the existing introduction to 7 in place of the words, "An independent, evidence-based study to find a suitable location for a hub airport, or a suitable airport to expand into a hub, but the remit of the commission must include".*
- iv) *In 7 a) after "airport", inserted the words ", should one be identified".*
- v) *In 7 b) deleted, "UK", and inserted the words, "which serve the South-East of England".*
- vi) *Inserted 8. e).*

*Conference voted in support of an amendment which inserted 2.*

*Conference voted in support of another amendment which in 3 inserted the existing words place of, "opposition to an extension of night flights".*

*Conference voted to remove the words in G beginning, "however, we recognise...".*

*Conference also voted to retain the words in 7.*

### **Sustainable Prosperity and Jobs Policy Paper**

Conference notes that:

- A. In the years since the financial crisis first struck, economic recovery has been fragile; the national economy is £250 billion smaller in 2012 than was forecast by the last government in 2008 – and this impacts on us all.
- B. Hard-pressed households need relief from the relentless rise in prices while their income remains static; young people need more job opportunities; and we all need an economy that supports a civilised level of welfare support, public services and the peace of mind they bring.
- C. However, the UK's current difficulties are not solely a product of the recent crisis; they are also the result of longer-term structural problems in our economy, including:
  - i) Several regions have economies that are far less vibrant and robust than those in London and the southeast of England.
  - ii) The banking sector is highly consolidated, and needs reform.
  - iii) Educational outcomes across the UK are unequal and below the level we need in an increasingly technological and competitive world.
  - iv) The UK consistently struggles to bridge the gap between academic research and successful commercial exploitation.

Conference believes that the three pillars of our vision for sustainable prosperity should be:

- I. Social sustainability: a society in which every individual has a stake and in which all can participate and shape their own future.
- II. Environmental sustainability: such that we will not squander the natural environment's assets that will be needed by future generations.
- III. Economic sustainability: an economic system where the current generation can enjoy the fruits of its endeavours without relying for its living standards on a legacy of debt for the next generation.

Conference further believes that individuals and local communities have the potential to flourish if they are empowered and provided with opportunity, and that economic policies will only be sustainable if they address the underlying problems that hamper long-term development.

Conference therefore endorses policy paper 105, Sustainable Prosperity and Jobs, as a distinctive Liberal Democrat approach to achieving sustainable prosperity, and in particular welcomes its proposals to:

- 1. Revive Local Economies, including through:
  - a) Allocation of a portion of future rounds of the Regional Growth Fund so that Local Enterprise Partnerships can bid for a pot of money to hold their own Growth Funds.
  - b) Giving responsibility for business rates to local authorities and creating a fairer system where rates are based on undeveloped site values.
  - c) Pioneering Small Business Zones, a space where new businesses, co ops and social enterprises are encouraged, and New Enterprise Hubs, to improve the success rate of business start-ups.
- 2. Open up access to finance, including through:

- a) Giving the new Financial Conduct Authority a statutory responsibility to foster a diverse banking system in the UK.
  - b) Opening up the payment system to be genuinely accessible to new financial institutions.
  - c) Facilitating the emergence and growth of new lenders, in particular by restructuring parts of RBS into local and community banks.
3. Realise everyone's potential, including by:
- a) Extending OFSTED's inspection focus on behaviour in schools to cover the wider aspects of 'employability' and 'life' skills.
  - b) Guaranteeing the wide availability of apprenticeships and focusing on re-skilling unemployed people through expansion of apprenticeships in part by specifying local content on major public infrastructure projects.
4. Unlock innovation, including by:
- a) Channelling a greater proportion of public procurement through the Technology Strategy Board to encourage innovation in the public sector supply-chain.
  - b) Reviewing patent law to ensure that new ideas are encouraged and commercialised.
5. Fulfil our low-carbon vision for Britain, including by:
- a) Expanding the Green Investment Bank's scale and remit as fast as possible, including relaxing the restriction on its ability to borrow before total public sector debt begins to fall.
  - b) Taking additional actions to increase the flow of capital to low-carbon investments, including fulfilling the coalition commitment to create innovative financial products.
  - c) Using government procurement policies to stimulate the market for green products.
  - d) Adopting a 'closed loop' approach, whereby use of materials is reduced, reused where possible and recycled for further use.
6. Introduce a world of export opportunities to small businesses, including by:
- a) Introducing a 'supply chain buddying' programme, whereby large companies already engaged in export undertake to support SMEs in their supply chain to find new overseas customers.
  - b) Extending the 'Passport to Export' to include SMEs that are more than five years old.
7. Further support small businesses by:
- a) Increasing the prospects for rescuing businesses in difficulty through an amendment to the Insolvency Act 1986, to prevent insolvency being used by utilities as a sole reason for the termination of supply or increase in tariffs to businesses, while retaining the right to require a personal guarantee, as well as being able to withdraw supply should payments cease; thereby providing a lifeline for businesses and the people that work for them, ensuring that many more

survive to contribute to economic growth in the future.

- b) Streamlining processes to allow the Insolvency Service to be more efficient in enforcing the existing regime for disqualification of directors.

*Applicability: Federal, except 1, 3, and 5 d) which are England only.*

*Background briefing: This motion and the accompanying policy paper develop policy on the re-balancing of the UK economy, building on policies already set out in the 2010 General Election Manifesto, Change That Works for You.*

*Conference rejected an amendment which would have inserted the words, “including by applying public procurement provisions to all levels of public authority, in line with the EU Energy Efficiency Directive.”, in 5 c) after the word “products”.*

*Conference voted in support of an amendment which added 7).*

### **Tackling Inequality at its Roots (Inequality Policy Paper)**

Conference recalls the preamble to the party constitution, which states that The Liberal Democrats exist to build and safeguard a fair, free and open society, in which we seek to balance the fundamental values of liberty, equality and community’.

Conference believes that for Liberal Democrats, inequality matters when it:

- I. Is an obstacle to individuals determining their own destinies and reduces aspirations.
- II. Prevents talent from fulfilling its potential to the detriment of the economy and society.
- III. Creates a sense of unfairness, weakening the fabric of society and setting groups of people against each other.

Conference regrets that current levels of inequality in the United Kingdom are too high, leading to these problems.

Conference further believes that addressing socio-economic inequality benefits everyone, not just the poor.

Conference recognises that:

- A. Inequality often perpetuates itself between generations as well as through individual lifetimes.
- B. This is in part due to the harmful effects of child poverty on future life chances, but it is not only to do with income levels but also inequality of aspirations and individual capabilities, which evidence shows are determined in the earliest years of people’s lives.
- C. Lack of capabilities such as confidence, empathy and self-discipline – as well as educational qualifications – is a major obstacle to social mobility and a major cause of entrenched inequality.

Conference therefore endorses policy paper 107, *Tackling Inequality at its Roots*, and its emphasis on ways to strengthen everybody’s capabilities when they need that support most.

Conference in particular welcomes its proposals to:

1. Introduce a Capabilities Index and a Life Chances Indicator in order to measure the key obstacles that inequality creates – this would be more nuanced than established measures of poverty and inequality because they would capture the complex and multi-dimensional nature of the problems people face in their real lives, while continuing to measure income inequality; it is important that existing work on such an index is further developed to give full weight to social and community capability as well as economic and governance capabilities.
2. Make the strongest efforts to give support to pre-school children and their parents, including:
  - a) Creating a ‘Nursery Premium’ to target extra resources towards improved pre-school provision and parenting support for the most disadvantaged families.
  - b) Extending the entitlement to parental leave to a total of eighteen months to be shared between parents provided that each parent takes at least six months.
3. Take steps to promote fair access to services including by:
  - a) Promoting co-provision and the involvement of voluntary groups in helping people to access services and support.
  - b) Placing obligations on private sector service providers to develop social tariffs which would offer their lowest rates to those in most need.
  - c) Requiring financial services providers to tackle financial exclusion for example by ensuring reasonable access to free cash point facilities in low-income areas.
  - d) Robustly implementing the public sector equality duties under the Equality Act 2010 through processes and mechanisms to drive continuous improvements in public bodies’ responsiveness to the needs of disadvantaged groups and individuals, to cover each equality strand including the duty to address socio-economic disadvantage, and ensure that the public have the tools to hold public authorities to account.
4. Tackle inequality and insecurity at work by:
  - a) Increasing the power of shareholders to hold senior management to account.
  - b) Requiring companies with over 250 employees publish average pay in each quintile – and provide a rationale for the ratios between them and the top earners at both board and sub-board level.
  - c) Investing in training or re-skilling both for those in work and during periods of unemployment.
5. Address inequality in wealth and assets by switching the balance of taxation towards those with the broadest shoulders, and in particular increasing taxes on unearned income and wealth, starting with an annual Mansion Tax on the excess value of residential properties over £2 million as a first step towards wealth taxation designed to reduce inequality
6. Tackle the undue political influence of big money in politics by:
  - a) Working to achieve reform of party funding with caps on large donations and strict limits on campaign expenditure.

- b) Pressing for the effective registration and publication of contacts between ministers and lobbyists.
- c) Reforming the House of Lords to end political patronage and make politics more accountable to the people.

*Applicability: Federal, except 2 and 3 a) which are England only.*

*Background briefing: This motion and the accompanying policy paper set out an overall Liberal Democrat approach to socio-economic inequality. In particular it updated policy on measurement of inequality, early years and parenting, access to services and inequality in wealth and assets.*

*Conference voted in support of an amendment which:*

- i) In 1 inserted the words from, "it is important that existing work".*
- ii) Inserted 3 d).*
- iii) In 5 inserted the existing words after, "wealth".*

### **20 is Plenty - Saving Lives on the Road**

Conference notes:

- i) Among member states of the EU, the UK has the highest proportion of pedestrian road fatalities, and half of road deaths and serious injuries in Britain occur on roads with 30 mph limits.
- ii) Among member states of the EU, the UK has one of the poorest levels of children walking or cycling to school and many parents cite danger from fast traffic as a reason for not allowing their children to travel to school on foot or by bike.
- iii) Lowering the normal residential speed limit from 30 mph to 20 mph would make roads safer; in particular a study by the Transport Research Laboratory has found 20 mph limits decrease child pedestrian accidents by 70%.
- iv) It has been shown that half of people hit by a car at 30 mph will die and only 10% of people hit by a car at 20 mph will die.
- v) Widespread use of 20 mph limits in certain local areas, such as Portsmouth, Oxford, Lancashire, Brighton & Hove and Bath & North East Somerset has been both popular and made roads safer.
- vi) According to the British Social Attitudes Survey 2011, 71% of drivers support 20 mph on residential streets.
- vii) Slower speeds result in smaller exhaust emissions, less noise and lighter congestion.
- viii) The greater safety of 20 mph is well demonstrated in insurance premiums being less in areas with a significant number of 20 mph limits.
- ix) Road injuries are hugely expensive: the Department for Transport estimates that the average cost per seriously injured casualty on the roads is £178,160 and the average cost per fatality is £1,585,510.
- x) The relatively small cost of changing speed limits (e.g. new signage) pays for itself many times over by preventing costly accidents.

Conference congratulates the Department of Transport for relaxing requirements for 20 mph limits to be introduced in that it is no longer mandatory to add physical measures such as bumps.

Conference believes:

- a) Speed limits on residential roads are currently too high and, in particular, the normal speed limit on residential roads should be reduced from 30 mph to 20 mph.
- b) Lower speed limits will make the streets safer for pedestrian, cyclists and car users alike and will encourage more people to walk and cycle with consequential benefits for health and quality of life.

Conference calls for:

1. All roads in new residential developments to have a speed limit of 20 mph.
2. Local authorities to give active consideration to introducing 20 mph limits in existing residential and other suitable roads over the next few years, with schemes to be designed in consultation with local residents.
3. The government to give appropriate financial support to local authorities to ensure that up-front costs of conversion are no barrier to changing speed limits.
4. A minister in the Department for Transport to be responsible for working with the relevant local authorities on the conversion to 20 mph limits in residential areas and to report at least annually on progress toward this goal.

*Applicability: England.*

*Background Briefing: This motion develops policy for speed limits in residential areas. Previous policy is set out in conference motion Safer Roads and Streets for All (2003).*

*Conference voted in support of an amendment which inserted the existing words in 2 in place of the words, "2. All existing residential roads currently on a 30 mph to move to a 20 mph over a period of 10 years, with an aim for 10% of all roads to have the lower speed limit introduced each year".*

*Conference voted in support of another amendment which inserted the existing words in 4 in place of the words, "put in charge of the national", with the existing words beginning with, "responsible for working with the relevant local authorities on the...".*

## **Business Motion**

### ***Membership Subscriptions and Federal Levy***

Conference notes that:

- a) The Federal Executive is proposing that there be no change in the Minimum, Concessionary, or Youth and Student SAO subscription rates, and no change in the Federal Levy.
- b) The Federal Executive is proposing that the recommended rate should rise from £62 to £65.
- c) The proposed minimum rate, together with our concessionary rate of £6 for those receiving or entitled to receive state benefits, maintains our position of offering access to the widest possible proportion of society.

Conference resolves that for the year 2013:

- 1. The recommended subscription rate shall be £65.
- 2. The minimum subscription rate shall be £12.
- 3. The concessionary subscription rate for those in receipt of, or entitled to, state benefits other than child benefit or state pension shall be £6.
- 4. Those paying their subscription through the Youth and Student SAO shall pay a minimum of £6 or, where a new member joins, a special introductory rate of £1.
- 5. Nothing in this motion prevents a State Party from setting a recommended rate or rates of subscription by its internal procedures which is higher than that agreed by the Federal Conference.

Conference further resolves that for the year 2013 the Federal Levy on new members shall be 0% of the subscription paid and the Federal Levy on renewal subscriptions shall be 44%.

*Applicability: Federal*

## Constitutional Amendments

### ***Compliance with Equality Act 2010***

#### Article 2.4

*At the end of the first sentence of 2.4 insert the words “subject to the provisions of the Equality Act 2010 (the Act).” and delete remainder of existing 2.4.*

*Then insert the following words: “If and insofar as the Act may be amended to permit positive action by political parties to secure adequate representation of groups having protected characteristics within the meaning of the Act on internal party bodies, and there is no opportunity to propose an constitutional amendment to Conference before a relevant internal election, the Federal Executive shall introduce such provisions as they consider to be appropriate to take advantage of such amendment of the Act. The Federal Executive shall ensure that such provisions as they may so introduce shall be brought before Conference as a constitutional amendment at the next reasonable opportunity.*

Where this Constitution or any Standing Orders made there under appear to conflict with the Act, the provisions of the Act shall prevail.”

#### Article 11.5 (g)

*Delete all and insert: “A system will be put in place to secure adequate representation of groups having protected characteristics within the meaning of the Equality Act 2010.”*

#### Article 11.9 (g)

*Delete all and insert: “A system will be put in place to secure adequate representation of groups having protected characteristics within the meaning of the Equality Act 2010.”*

#### Article 14.1 (a)

*Delete the words in brackets.*

#### Article 14.4 (c)

*Delete sub-paragraph c and re-letter accordingly*

*Applicability: Federal.*

### ***Lords Elections***

#### Article 11.2

*Divide 1.2 by inserting a letter (a) in brackets in between ‘9.1.’ and ‘The’ and then inserting at the end a new 11.2 (b):*

- (b) The Joint Candidates Committee shall co-ordinate the maintenance of standards and the performance of the functions specified in Article 11.1 for the first elections to the House of Lords (or any fully or partially elected replacement second chamber of the Westminster Parliament). If it is not possible for there to be an appropriate constitutional amendment before the first elections the procedures to be adopted for the purposes of article 11.1 shall be based as far as possible on the provisions of clauses 11.5 and 11.9 as appropriate.

Article 11.8

*Divide 11.8 by inserting a letter (a) in brackets at the beginning of 11.8 and inserting at the end a new 11.8 (b):*

- (b) If necessary the Joint Candidates Committee shall produce an emergency set of procedures for the first elections to the House of Lords (or any fully or partially elected replacement second chamber of the Westminster Parliament) if an election has been called or is likely to be called in the near future.

## Questions on Reports to Conference

### ***Federal Conference Committee***

#### **Q1. Gareth Epps, Greater Reading**

What discussions and actions has the Federal Conference Committee taken to implement the resolution of Federal Conference in autumn 2011 *Accreditation for Party Conference*?

#### **Reply by Andrew Wiseman (Chair, Federal Conference Committee)**

Our efforts in relation to accreditation have been twofold. General discussions on security required for this conference with Sussex police and the Home Office and specific discussions with the Home Office regarding the principle of and need for accreditation.

The specific arrangements for security at this conference were come to after a full and detailed assessment of the risk and the threat to conference. This includes a number of meetings; I have attended a large number of these meetings and made it clear that FCC and conference have real concerns over the need and effectiveness of accreditation. Unfortunately accreditation seems to be part of the general make up of security at party political conferences (and other events such as the Olympics).

FCC made it clear we were not convinced as to the need for accreditation. Under the constitution FFAC has responsibility for financial and resourcing issues. Given this FCC referred accreditation to FFAC for their views.

We have also made our view clear to the Home Office in meetings with the relevant section. They have decided to carry out a review of accreditation at party political conferences. This is due to report later this year and the recommendations should be in place for next year.

#### ***Supplementary Question***

Last year's motion condemned accreditation. My concern is around insurance. Was what you were saying about FFAC being consulted due to the fact that FCC was unconvinced on the insurance issue?

#### **Reply by Andrew Wiseman (Chair, Federal Conference Committee)**

Insurance came into debate, but this is not a direct discussion in regards to insurance. There was clear advice from the police to have accreditation. We recognise there are financial risks without accreditation.

#### **Q2. Zoë O'Connell, Cambridge**

In 2011, conference called upon FCC to "negotiate security arrangements for future conferences which protect the privacy of members' personal data and which respect the

party's constitution and internal democracy".

a) What actions has the FCC taken in this regard in respect of:

- i) Negotiating on the necessity of accreditation itself.
- ii) Obtaining guarantees for the security of personal information held by the police and third parties such as Events force.

b) What actions will FCC now take to avoid accreditation at future conferences?

c) How many people were refused accreditation for this conference?

**Reply by Andrew Wiseman (Chair, Federal Conference Committee)**

In relation to the party's own system, events force, all data is held on a secure data server hosted by a leading data hosting company. We own the rights and title to all the data and no one else has access to it.

The data is transferred to the police through the national Conference Accreditation System which is only available to staff who work on the National Accreditation Team along with a few officers from each of the local host forces (i.e Sussex Police Accreditation team). The system itself is secure on GMP IT infrastructure and is not used by any other personnel within Greater Manchester Police. We have been told that no more than 20 staff/officers have access during the accreditation process and access is protected by a username and password. The access to CAS is controlled by a senior officer and only authorised persons are issued access.

Any party member can ask for all their data to be deleted. This will require them to enter all the data again if we have accreditation again.

*Supplementary Question*

There was a special vetting process, where was that advertised and how many people used it?

**Reply by Andrew Wiseman (Chair, Federal Conference Committee)**

A special process was put in place for members with concerns for previous identities. That was organised through the Party President and that system is now up and running. I believe no one opted to go through the system for this Conference, but I will check that and e-mail you to confirm this as I was not involved in the process.

**Q3. Andrew Hudson, South Lakeland**

Why are representatives no longer able to register for both the Spring and Autumn Conferences at the same time?

**Reply by Andrew Wiseman (Chair, Federal Conference Committee)**

Firstly, the change made no difference in price. Everyone who registered early for the Spring

Conference was given a discount code to be used when registering for the Autumn Conference so financially registration should have cost attendees the same.

When opening registration for spring we were still negotiating the need for accreditation and did not want to ask for unnecessary data if we were not going to keep accreditation. We took the decision to open registration and provide a discount code to avoid asking for unnecessary data.

*Supplementary Question*

I accept that reasoning. Next time there are changes can we make it a lot clearer?

**Reply by Andrew Wiseman (Chair, Federal Conference Committee)**

Yes, certainly.

**Q4. Cllr Julie Smith, Cambridge**

Will FCC undertake to work with the Conference Office to end the apparent policy of giving priority for booking fringe venues to organisations from outside the party, so that SAOs, AOs and other party bodies will stand a better chance of booking affordable, appropriately sized rooms for their conference events?

**Reply by Andrew Wiseman (Chair, Federal Conference Committee)**

FCC looks at the pricing structure each year and will continue to do so. We have to balance the financial targets provided to us by FFAC and the heavily subsidised rate provided to party bookers. We have a limited number of rooms available at the subsidised rate, in terms of room sizes this varies dramatically from conference venue to conference venue.

*Supplementary Question*

I have three areas of concern. The first being the issue of priority given to commercial organisations, the second about the sponsor rules and the doubling of rates which I believe is a disincentive for sponsors; finally the issue of the high cost of stalls at Conference. Please could you look at these issues again and talk further to make it work better for everybody?

**Reply by Andrew Wiseman (Chair, Federal Conference Committee)**

FCC has a general purposes subcommittee which tries to keep an eye on this.

**Federal Executive**

**Q1. Gareth Epps, Reading**

What discussions and actions has the Federal Executive taken to implement the resolution of Federal Conference in autumn 2011 *Accreditation for Party Conference*?

**Reply by Tim Farron MP (President of the Liberal Democrats)**

Federal Executive did not discuss this resolution because it does not concern the Federal Executive. We will be referring part 3 to the Federal Appeals Panel.

**Q2. Simon McGrath, Merton Borough**

Following the launch of the Government's Social Mobility Strategy in 2011 and the comments by the Deputy Prime Minister asking employers not to use unpaid interns what steps have the Federal Executive taken to stop the use of unpaid interns in the Party?

**Reply by Tim Farron MP (President of the Liberal Democrats)**

It is party policy to introduce the use of 'name blind' job applications – this is already used for jobs under the control of the Federal Executive to aid social mobility. In January 12 Lib Dems signed the government social mobility pact. This gives people, no matter their background, the best opportunity. As a result of this we are helping a great deal of people.

I can also confirm that Interns are used at our HQ and are given expenses. We are looking into ways to ensure we pay them in the future.

*Supplementary Question*

We are still using unpaid interns then, but we seem to be doing the best we can. Is it possible to use name blinding for all jobs regardless of how senior the position?

**Reply by Tim Farron MP (President of the Liberal Democrats)**

We will consider name blinding further and write to you on this matter.

**Q3. Paula Keaveney, Cressington**

The Federal Executive report says that "we need to support our leadership as they fight for Lib Dem values in Government, and tell them when we think they're mistaken". Are there any concrete examples of the FE raising "mistakes" and if so what's happened as a result?

**Reply by Tim Farron MP (President of the Liberal Democrats)**

There are no concrete examples of the FE raising mistakes as yet.

*Supplementary Question*

What does Federal Executive actually do?

**Reply by Tim Farron MP (President of the Liberal Democrats)**

A large chunk of FE meetings get taken up by big issues like NHS reform. Views are expressed. Federal Executive also holds Nick and others to account, which I believe is a real strength.

## ***Federal Finance and Administration Committee***

### ***Q1. Submitted by Cllr Gareth Epps, Reading***

What discussions and actions have the Federal Finance and Administration Committee taken to implement the resolution of Federal Conference in Autumn 2011, *Accreditation For Party Conference*?

#### **Reply by Duncan Greenland (Chair of the Federal Finance and Administration Committee)**

The resolution mentioned did not ask FFAC to take any direct action. With regards to accreditation, our response is clear – we only became involved due to the request of the Federal Conference Committee.

#### *Supplementary Question*

What advice did the committee receive to indicate that conference would not be able to obtain insurance if accreditation was not accepted?

#### **Reply by Duncan Greenland (Chair of the Federal Finance and Administration Committee)**

It was the committee's strong opinion that in the event of an incident, any insurance company, despite having potentially insured the event, would resist paying out on any claim as we would have ignored the explicit advice of the home office and police services. This was clearly not something that the Party could afford.

### ***Q2. Submitted by Zoë O'Connell, Cambridge***

Why did FFAC ignore the wishes of the FCC in accepting accreditation and what actions will FFAC now take to avoid accreditation at future conferences?

#### **Reply by Duncan Greenland (Chair of the Federal Finance and Administration Committee)**

We as a committee did not ignore the wishes of the FCC. It was our understanding that FCC had failed to come to a conclusive decision and so asked for FFAC to take the decision on their behalf. It was a decision that we made reluctantly, but on request.

#### *Supplementary Question*

There has been a lot of confusion over the issue. Would FFAC be able to publish the decision-making process?

#### **Reply by Duncan Greenland (Chair of the Federal Finance and Administration Committee)**

As I mentioned before, we were asked by the Chair of the Federal Conference Committee. Our full decision was minuted and accepted by FE. Generally, these minutes are not released in full.

**Q3. Submitted by Linda Jack, East of England**

At Spring Conference Cllr Ron Beadle asked FFAC to provide the total membership of the party for each quarter from May 2010 to March 2012, expressed by region and state parties. Duncan Greenland (Chair, FFAC) replied that they could but would strongly prefer not to, as to do so would provide very valuable electoral intelligence to our rivals. In addition to this, membership is a state issue. Membership figures are released to state and regional parties on a monthly basis for their information (and action!).

Cllr Beadle asked a supplementary question: "I've heard conflicting answers to this question – can I have some clarification on whether you will answer this question fully?" Duncan Greenland's reply was "My view is that we would not do so and not provide a detailed answer to that question for the reasons I have just given – that it would provide our rivals with too great a degree of information. No other party would dream of doing so."

Why was this answer given when the FE knew that it would be submitting the full federal figure for December 2011 (48,934 i.e. a drop of 25% in one year) to the Electoral Commission? If this information is good enough to be submitted to the Electoral Commission then why is it not good enough for it to be discussed at Conference?

**Reply by Duncan Greenland (Chair of the Federal Finance and Administration Committee)**

I share your concern about the decrease in membership. However, it is clear that the information that was asked for in Spring goes far beyond what is required by law to be provided to the Electoral Commission. I repeat that we will not be publishing regional membership data as it would unduly benefit other parties.

**Parliamentary Parties of the Liberal Democrats**

**Q1. Gareth Epps, Reading**

What discussions and actions have the Parliamentary Parties in the Commons and the Lords taken to implement the resolution of Federal Conference in Autumn 2011 Accreditation For Party Conference?

**Q2. Zoë O'Connell, Cambridge**

In 2011, conference called upon the Parliamentary Party and Liberal Democrat ministers to "question the current police guidance on accreditation and to seek to persuade the Home Office to change guidance on current practice to reflect the rights of association and assembly and the internal democracy of all political parties." What actions have MPs and ministers taken to carry out this resolution?

**Reply by Alistair Carmichael MP to Q1 and Q2**

In the Commons we have pursued it, and within the party our Home Office minister has been pursuing this issue. Tom Brake has tabled a series of questions on the matter and there is an on-going Ministerial review. Something that I expect will get done through the Parliamentary Party Committee. Parliamentary Party Committees are made up by both the Commons and Lords, and they meet regularly and effectively in order to try and work out

where best to apply pressure. I would also expect Jeremy Browne, as our Minister in the Home Office to follow this through.

*Supplementary Question 1*

Is it possible for the Ministerial review to become better publicised within the party?

**Reply by Alistair Carmichael MP**

This is something we are working on.

**Q3. Zoë O'Connell, Cambridge**

Following the increased sharing of the equalities portfolio with Conservative MPs in the latest reshuffle, what assurances can the Parliamentary Party and Ministers give that they are still championing diversity and equality within Whitehall?

**Reply by Alistair Carmichael MP**

We are championing equality in Whitehall, absolutely. Jo has been working very hard on this, and I cannot think of anyone else better in the way in which she pursues equality issues.

**Q4. Christine Headley, Stroud**

What has happened to the proposal to move to BST in winter and possibly to double BST in summer?

**Reply by Alistair Carmichael MP**

The House considered this matter as a Private Members Bill by Rebecca Harris. It could not reach a consensus on the matter and the Bill fell. In order for something to happen, a further Bill would have to be introduced to the House again. The Government is clear that without consensus, any proposals would not be able to proceed.

**Q5. Christine Headley, Stroud**

Why, as reported, are Liberal Democrat Members of Parliament being whipped on Equal Marriage legislation whilst our Coalition partners are not?

**Reply by Alistair Carmichael MP**

I was not consulted by Downing Street on the Conservative decision not to whip the vote. I start with the presumption that where we have a Government Minister, bringing forward a Government Bill, in Government time, there will be a whipped vote. But obviously we do not yet know what we will be voting on; when we do there will be a discussion at our parliamentary party meeting.

**Q6. Simon McGrath, Merton Borough**

Following the launch of the Government's Social Mobility Strategy in 2011 and the comments by the Deputy Prime Minister asking employers not to use unpaid interns why are

Lib Dem MPs still using unpaid interns?

**Reply by Alistair Carmichael MP**

Each MP is a separate employer and so responsible for their own office arrangements. I choose to employ my interns on a minimum wage. IPSA also insist that any MP who pays interns expenses, sign an interns agreement, which sets out what both MPs and interns can expect from an internship experience.

**Q7. Cllr Julian Cooper, West Oxfordshire**

Can conference be told why significant amounts of money has been authorised under the 'gateway process' for the replacement of the nuclear missile programme?

**Reply by Alistair Carmichael MP**

I will write to the member personally after conference has ended.

*This answer was sent to Cllr Cooper after Conference:*

Liberal Democrats are clear in our opposition to the like-for-like replacement of Trident and Danny Alexander is overseeing a review into alternatives. This Cabinet Office-led review began in March 2011 under Nick Harvey's stewardship and will report to the Prime Minister and Deputy Prime Minister at the end of this year.

As the Conservatives want to renew Trident, this is an area where the Coalition partners have compromised. But we have ensured that the decision on whether to go ahead with the renewal of Trident will be made in 2016, after the next General Election, and we will continue to make the case for alternatives in the meantime.

However, in order for that decision to be made in 2016 some preparatory work has to go ahead now, which we have agreed to. This is absolutely not pre-empting or undermining the 2016 'Main Gate' decision, which is the final say on the renewal or otherwise of Trident.